Remarks/Arguments

The present amendment is submitted in an earnest effort to advance this case to issue without delay.

1, The priority acknowledgment in paragraph 12 of PTOL 326 is appreciated.

2. The claims have been amended to emphasize that the nozzle orifices (6) are formed by channels (5) formed in the outer peripheries of the inserts (11) where they meet the walls of the bores (10) and where those bores open at the flat surface (e.g. (12)) of the nozzle.

With these structural limitations in all of the claims, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC(b) as being anticipated by the BENENATI patent 5,352,109 has been overcome. BENENATI does not disclose or suggest any equivalent flat surface at which a nozzle bore opens in conjunction with an insert body which terminates at that surface and fits into the bore so that a nozzle orifice (orifices) associated with that bore are formed at that same surface.

3. For the record, applicants submit that this amendment to claim 1 and thus the incorporation of these limitations in all of the claims which remain, also preclude a rejection under 35 USC 103(a) on a combination of BENENATI and BUEHNING patent 5,632,938.

While a flat surface may be provided at 28 of BUEHNING, that flat surface is not the terminus of bore 49 and for that bore, the orifice 72 is not at a flat surface and is not formed by an insert body or defined by a channel in that insert body along the outer periphery thereof.

Accordingly even if BENENATI could be modified as taught by BUEHNING or BUEHNING could be modified as taught by BENENATI, the result would not be the structure which is now recited in claim 1.

4. Applicants believe that a technological review of the invention may be beneficial.

The invention is an apparatus for producing thermoplastic synthetic resin fibers whereby at least one melt passage for feeding a molten synthetic resin is provided. The device has a nozzle which has at its outlet side at least one row of nozzle passages with nozzle orifices from which the molten synthetic resin can issue.

Conventional melt blown devices, for example of the BUEHNING type, have orifices which are formed directly at a nozzle tip and normally a single orifice is provided per tip or a single row defined between edges forming the tip.

The drawback of this construction is that the orifice density is very limited and thus, for example, an orifice density of less than 35 orifices per centimeter must be tolerated.

The invention by contrast permits orifice densities of 100 per centimeter or more, by defining those orifices at the flat surface by channels formed in each insert body fitted within the bore. Neither of the two references which have been applied by the Examiner attacks this problem or a related problem and neither contains the recited structure.

The fact that one can obtain a surprisingly high orifice density of 100 orifices per centimeter or more as a result is not suggested either.

The claims as now presented are thus deemed to be allowable and an early Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
The Firm of Karl F. Ross P.C.

By: Herbert Dubno, Reg. No. 19,752
Attorney for Applicants

ef-
June 3, 2005
5676 Riverdale Avenue Box 900
Bronx, NY 10471-0900
Cust. No.: 535
Tel: (718) 884-6600
Fax: (718) 601-1099